

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 6, 2006 in which claim 49 was withdrawn from consideration; claims 26-28 and 39-46 were objected and in which claims 1-25, 29-38 and 47-48 were rejected. With this response, claims 10, 37, 39, 47, 48 and 49 are canceled; claims 1, 7-9, 15-16, 22, 25-26, 28, 38, 40 and 45 are amended; and claims 50-55 are added. Claims 1-9, 11-36, 38, 40-46 and 50-55 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Objections to Claims 7, 10, 15, 22 and 25

Page 2 of the Office Action objected to claims 7, 10, 15, 22 and 25 based upon several noted formalities. Claim 10 is canceled. Claim 7 is amended to strike the term "first" such that the resulting limitation "the edge" had antecedent basis in claim 1. Claim 15 is amended to replace "the first end wall" with -- a first end wall --. Claims 22 and 25 are each amended to delete the term "launching" and "media launching", wherein the resulting limitation "a structure" has antecedent basis in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to such claims be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 10-25 and 38 under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected claims 10-25 and 38 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 10 is canceled. Claim 15 is amended to depend from claim 1 which has been amended to incorporate the limitations of former claim 10. Claim 25 is amended to delete the term "launching". Thus, it is now clear that the recited structure set forth in claim 25 is the same structure that has the edge as recited in claim 1.

Claim 15 is amended to replace "the first end wall" with -- a first end wall --. Thus, as recited in claim 15, the structure has an edge which includes a first continuous segment that terminates at a first end wall and a second end wall.

Claim 16 is amended to delete the limitation "the end walls" with -- the first end wall and the second end wall --.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection claim 20 be withdrawn. The Office Action asserted that it was not clear how the first and second channels are structurally related to the edge of the structure of claim 1. However, claim 20 specifically recites that the edge extends between the first channel and the second channel. Breadth of a claim does not render the claim indefinite.

Claim 38 is amended to clarify that each of the first continuous segment and the second continuous segment, recited in claim 1, has a recited minimum transverse width. Based on the above remarks and amended claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims of 11-25 and 38 be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 28-37 and 47-48 under 35 USC 102(B) Based upon Otsuki

Page 4 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-9, 28-37 and 47-48 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Otsuki US Patent Publication 2002/0070991. Claims 37 and 47-48 are canceled. Claims 1-9 and 28-36, as amended to overcome the rejection and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

A. Claim 1

Page 9 of the Office Action indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 10 is canceled with its limitations incorporated into base claim 1. In addition, the noted Section 112 issues with regard to former claim 10 have been addressed. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 28

Page 9 of the Office Action indicated that claim 39 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations a base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 39 is canceled with its limitations incorporated into base claim 28. Accordingly, claim 28, as amended, is believed to being condition for allowance. Claims 29-36 depend from claim 28 and overcome rejection for the same reasons.

IV. Added Claims

With this response, claims 50-55 are added. Claims 50-55 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

A. Claims 50-52

Claim 50 depends from claim 1 and further recites that the edge is configured to contact the underside of the supported medium. Claim 51 depends from claim 50 and recites that the edge is configured to contact the underside of the supported medium at a location opposite a portion of a top side of the supported medium as the portion is being printed upon by the print head.

Claim 52 depends from claim 28 and further recites that the edge is configured to contact the underside of the supported medium at a location opposite a portion of a top side of the supported medium as the portion is being printed upon by the print head.

The prior art to record, including Otsuki, fails to disclose an edge extending across a majority of the width of the media path, wherein the edge has first and second spaced continuous segments and wherein the edge is configured to contact the underside of the supported medium. The prior art record also fails to disclose an edge that contacts the medium at a location opposite a portion of a top side of the supported medium as the portion is being printed upon by the print head. Accordingly, claims 50-52 are presented for consideration and allowance.

B. Claim 53

Page 9 of the Office Action indicated that claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations a base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 20 is rewritten in independent form as added claim 53 and includes all of the limitations of former base claim 1. Accordingly, claim 53 is presented for consideration and allowance.

C. Claim 54

Page 9 of the Office Action indicated that claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations a base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 25 is rewritten in independent form as added claim 54 and includes all of the limitations of former base claim 1 and intervening claim 2. Claim 54, as written, additionally overcomes the previous rejection of claim 25 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claim 54 is presented for consideration and allowance.

D. Claim 55

Page 9 of the Office Action indicated that claim 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations a base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 26 is rewritten in independent form as added claim 55 and includes all of the limitations of former base claim 1 and intervening claim 2. Claim 55, as written, additionally overcomes the previous rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claim 55 is presented for consideration and allowance.

V. Conclusion

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-9, 11-36, 38, 40-46 and 50-55 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Jan. 3, 2007

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276